



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov
DPM Mar-06

DEBORAH K. HENSCHIED, ESQ.
SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 E. VAN BUREN
PHOENIX AZ 85004-2202

COPY MAILED

MAR 07 2006

In re Application of :
Aron T. Lunde :
Application No. 10/053,963 : OFFICE OF PETITIONS
Filed: 22 January, 2002 : DECISION ON PETITION
Attorney Docket No. 37829.0400 :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 22 September, 2005, under 37 CFR 1.137(b),¹ to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is GRANTED.

The application became abandoned on 6 October, 2005, for failure to timely file a proper reply to the Notice of Appeal filed on 5 August, 2005, which set a two (2) month shortened period for reply. No extension of the time for reply in accordance with 37

¹ Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continuing examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application, abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

CFR 1.136(a) were filed. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 9 May, 2005.

Petitioner has filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and fee as the required reply, and indicated that the amendment filed on 7 February, 2005, a copy of which is included with the present petition is the submission required by 37 CFR 1.114.

The statement contained in the instant petition does not set forth that the entire delay from the due date of the required reply to the date of the filing of a grantable petition was unintentional as required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3). However, the statement contained in the instant petition is being so construed. Petitioner **must** notify the Office if this is not a correct interpretation.

This application is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 2823 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3231.



Douglas I. Wood
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions